



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/544,704	04/07/2000	Yossef Tsuria	U013185-5	9892

140 7590 12/09/2003

LADAS & PARRY
26 WEST 61ST STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10023

EXAMINER

ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/544,704

Applicant(s)

TSURIA, YOSSEF

Examiner

Kaveh Abrishamkar

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4,5,6. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed on 04/02/2000. Claims 1-28 were received for consideration. No amendments to the claims were filed. Claims 1-28 are currently being considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 10-12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Linnartz (U.S. 6,314,518).

Regarding claim 10, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark examiner for examining an electronic representation of an item for a watermark, the examiner comprising:

a watermark definition store operative to store a watermark definition (column 1 lines 10-11, column 2 lines 1-19, Fig.1 item 13, column 3 lines 62-65) ;

watermark examination apparatus operatively associated with the watermark definition store and operative to examine an electronic representation of an item for a watermark in accordance with the watermark definition stored in the watermark definition store (Fig. 5, column 2 lines 1-31, column 4 lines 60-67, column 6 lines 39-43, column 7 lines 21-43, column 8 lines 43-49, column 9 18-22);and

a watermark definition signal receiver operative to receive a signal indicating that a new watermark definition is to be used for examining electronic representation and to store the new watermark definition in the watermark definition store (column 1 lines 5-16, column 2 lines 1-19, column 3 lines 58-65).

Claim 11 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 10. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark examiner according to claim 10 and wherein the watermark definition comprises an indication of a location, within each electronic representation to be examined, at which a watermark, if present, is to be found (column 2 lines 20-31).

Claim 12 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 10. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark examiner according to claim 10 and wherein the watermark definition comprises an indication of a watermarking method according to which each electronic representation to be examined is to be examined for a watermark (column 2

Art Unit: 2131

lines 20-31, column 3 lines 58-65, column 4 lines 7-10, column 6 lines 66-67, column 7 lines 36-42).

Claim 14 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 10. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark examiner according to claim 10 and wherein the watermark examiner also comprises a watermark storage memory for storing at least one watermark definition (Fig 1. column 3 lines 58-65), and

the watermark definition signal receiver is operative to retrieve the new watermark definition from the watermark storage memory in response to the received signal (Fig 1. column 3 lines 58-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1 –9, 13, and 15-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linnartz (U.S. 6,314,518) in view of Bloom et al. (U.S. 6,332,194).

Regarding claim 1, Linnartz discloses:

A method for examining an electronic representation of an item for a watermark, the method comprising:

examining at least a first electronic representation of an item for a watermark in accordance with a first watermark definition (Fig. 5, column 2 lines 1-31, column 4 lines 60-67, column 6 lines 39-43, column 7 lines 21-43, column 8 lines 43-49, column 9 lines 18-22).

Linnartz does not explicitly describe the receiving of a signal indicating that a second watermark definition is to be used for examining electronic representations, and then examining at least a second electronic representation of an item for a watermark in accordance with the second watermark definition. Bloom teaches the process of inserting a second watermark into a data representation (column 3 lines 24-37, column 4 lines 6-40, column 6 lines 65-67). Linnartz teaches a system comprising a decoder device containing a decoder and a detector. There is also a linking means for communicating watermark information between the detector and the control means (column 2 lines 5-15). This system can communicate supplemental watermark information and therefore should be able to provide information to the decoder device whether or not to consider the second watermark outlined by Bloom. The detector device outlined by Linnartz could then examine the second watermark instead of the first watermark. This would provide a more robust system of watermarking which is more resistant to tampering. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the second

watermark taught by Bloom in conjunction with the system outlined by Linnartz to provide a more robust watermarking system which is able to receive signals regarding watermarks, and is able to examine a second watermark if desired.

Regarding claim 17, Linnartz discloses:

A method for altering an electronic representation of an item having a watermark, the method comprising:

providing a first electronic representation comprising a first watermark, the first watermark corresponding to a first watermark definition (Fig. 5, column 2 lines 1-31, column 4 lines 60-67, column 6 lines 39-43, column 7 lines 21-43, column 8 lines 43-49, column 9 18-22);

Linnartz does not explicitly describe the receiving of a signal indicating that a second watermark definition is to be used for examining electronic representations, and then examining at least a second electronic representation of an item for a watermark in accordance with the second watermark definition. Bloom teaches the process of inserting a second watermark into a data representation (column 3 lines 24-37, column 4 lines 6-40, column 6 lines 65-67). Linnartz teaches a system comprising a decoder device containing a decoder and a detector. There is also a linking means for communicating watermark information between the detector and the control means (column 2 lines 5-15). This system can communicate supplemental watermark information and therefore should be able to provide information to the decoder device

Art Unit: 2131

whether or not to consider the second watermark outlined by Bloom. The detector device outlined by Linnartz could then examine the second watermark instead of the first watermark. This would provide a more robust system of watermarking which is more resistant to tampering. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the second watermark taught by Bloom in conjunction with the system outlined by Linnartz to provide a more robust watermarking system which is able to receive signals regarding watermarks, and is able to examine a second watermark if desired.

Linnartz does not explicitly describe a second watermark definition, and therefore does not explicitly altering the first electronic representation to comprise a second watermark corresponding to the second watermark definition. Following the logic applied above in describing the use of a second watermark definition in combination with the system delineated by Linnartz, it is obvious to follow the teachings of Linnartz to alter the first electronic representation to comprise a second watermark taught by Bloom. Linnartz teaches the altering of an electronic representation to comprise a watermark (column 1 lines 5-15, column 2 lines 1-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine the method of altering the electronic representation to comprise a watermark provided by Linnartz to alter the electronic representation to comprise the second watermark described by Bloom. This would provide the benefit of redundancy and would provide a more secure and robust

watermark system that could fallback onto an alternate watermark if the first watermark is compromised, altered, or tampered.

Regarding claim 22, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark alteration system for altering an electronic representation of an item having a watermark, the system comprising:

a watermark definition signal receiver for receiving a signal indicating that a watermark definition is to be used; and

watermark alteration apparatus for altering an electronic representation.

Linnartz does not explicitly describe the receiving of a signal indicating that a second watermark definition is to be used for examining electronic representations. Bloom teaches the process of inserting a second watermark into a data representation (column 3 lines 24-37, column 4 lines 6-40, column 6 lines 65-67). Linnartz teaches a system comprising a decoder device containing a decoder and a detector. There is also a linking means for communicating watermark information between the detector and the control means (column 2 lines 5-15). This system can communicate supplemental watermark information and therefore should be able to provide information to the decoder device whether or not to consider the second watermark outlined by Bloom. The detector device outlined by Linnartz could then examine the second watermark instead of the first watermark. This would provide a more robust system of watermarking which is more resistant to tampering. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made

Art Unit: 2131

to use the second watermark taught by Bloom in conjunction with the system outlined by Linnartz to provide a more robust watermarking system which is able to receive signals regarding watermarks, and is able to examine a second watermark if desired.

Linnartz teaches the altering of an electronic representation to comprise a watermark (column 1 lines 5-15, column 2 lines 1-31), but does not explicitly state altering the state to comprise a second watermark as taught by Bloom. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine the method of altering the electronic representation to comprise a watermark provided by Linnartz to alter the electronic representation to comprise the second watermark described by Bloom. This would provide the benefit of redundancy and would provide a more secure and robust watermark system that could fallback onto an alternate watermark if the first watermark is compromised, altered, or tampered.

Regarding claim 27, Linnartz discloses:

A signal for indicating to a watermark examiner that a definition is to be used for examining electronic representations, the signal comprising:

A representation of a watermark definition

Linnartz does not explicitly describe the receiving of a signal indicating that a second watermark definition is to be used for examining electronic representations, and then examining at least a second electronic representation of an item for a watermark in accordance with the second watermark definition. Bloom teaches the process of

Art Unit: 2131

inserting a second watermark into a data representation (column 3 lines 24-37, column 4 lines 6-40, column 6 lines 65-67). Linnartz teaches a system comprising a decoder device containing a decoder and a detector. There is also a linking means for communicating watermark information between the detector and the control means (column 2 lines 5-15). This system can communicate supplemental watermark information and therefore should be able to provide information to the decoder device whether or not to consider the second watermark outlined by Bloom. The detector device outlined by Linnartz could then examine the second watermark instead of the first watermark. This would provide a more robust system of watermarking which is more resistant to tampering. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the second watermark taught by Bloom in conjunction with the system outlined by Linnartz to provide a more robust watermarking system which is able to receive signals regarding watermarks, and is able to examine a second watermark if desired.

Claim 2 is rejected applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses a method of examining an electronic representation of an item for a watermark, comprising controlling access to an electronic representation. Linnartz does not explicitly describe controlling access to the second electronic representation based on a result of examining at least a second electronic representation step. Bloom delineates a second electronic representation that is used to create a second watermark that is inserted into the data representation. Linnartz teaches an embodiment of the receiver

Art Unit: 2131

device that secures the communications against tampering (column 2 lines 32-41).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the access control system delineated by Linnartz on the to control access to the second electronic representation described by Bloom to achieve a more secure and robust communication between sender and receiver.

Claim 3 is rejected applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses a method of examining an electronic representation of an item of a watermark. Linnartz describes one electronic representation, but does not explicitly describe a second electronic representation. Bloom describes a scenario where the first and second electronic representations are identical (column 7 lines 1-8). The addition of the second electronic representation adds another layer of security to the invention of Linnartz in that it now provides redundant watermarks, in case the first watermark is tampered with or altered. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine the system taught by Linnartz with the two identical electronic representations delineated by Bloom to create a more secure and redundant watermark system that is more resistant to tampering and alteration.

Claim 4 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses a method of receiving and decoding signals by using the disclosed receiver and decoder device (column 2 lines 31). Also, Linnartz delineates a separate control

Art Unit: 2131

signal that can direct the receiver to perform certain actions including instructions to examine a watermark based on a definition that can be supplied in the control signal. Bloom delineates a second electronic representation of a watermark definition. Using the logic used above in rejecting claim 1, after the combination of the system of Linnartz with the second watermark of Bloom, it is necessary to communicate the second watermark definition in order to examine and recognize the watermark inserted in the data. Linnartz has a system to communicate this watermark definition through use of its control signal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the control signal of Linnartz to communicate the second watermark definition of Bloom in the signal in order to allow the decoder to recognize and examine the watermark in the data.

Claim 5 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A method according to claim 1 and also comprising:

retrieving the second watermark definition from a storage device in response to the received signal (Fig 1. column 3 lines 58-65).

Claim 6 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

Art Unit: 2131

A method according to claim 1 and also comprising computing the second watermark definition in response to the received signal (column 3 lines 45-47, column 5 lines 42-67, column 6 lines 1-38).

Claim 7 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A method according to claim 1 and wherein the first watermark definition and the second watermark definition each comprises an indication of a location, within each electronic representation to be examined, at which a watermark, if present, is to be found (column 2 lines 20-31).

Claim 8 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A method according to claim 1 and wherein the first watermark definition and the second watermark definition each comprises an indication of a watermarking method according to which each electronic representation to be examined is to be examined for a watermark (column 2 lines 20-31, column 3 lines 58-65, column 4 lines 7-10, column 6 lines 66-67, column 7 lines 36-42).

Claim 9 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A method according to claim 1 and wherein the signal comprises authentication information for establishing that the signal originates from an authentic source (column 2 lines 33-41, column 8 lines 57-62), and

the receiving step also includes:

verifying the authentication information to determine whether the authentication information is correct and rejecting the received signal if the authentication information is determine to be incorrect, thereby causing the first watermark definition to be used for examining if the authentication information is incorrect (column 2 lines 33-41, column 8 lines 57-62).

Claim 13 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 10. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark examiner according to claim 10 and wherein the signal comprises a representation of a watermark definition (column 1 lines 5-16, column 2 lines 1-31, column 3 lines 58-65).

However, Linnartz does not explicitly describe that this signal represents a second watermark definition. Bloom delineates a second electronic representation of a watermark definition. Using the logic used above in rejecting claim 1, after the combination of the system of Linnartz with the second watermark of Bloom, it is necessary to communicate the second watermark definition in order to examine and recognize the watermark inserted in the data. Linnartz has a system to communicate this watermark definition through use of its control signal. It would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2131

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the control signal of Linnartz to communicate the second watermark definition of Bloom in the signal in order to allow the decoder to recognize and examine the watermark in the data.

Claim 15 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 10. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark examiner according to claim 10 and wherein the watermark definition signal receiver is also operative to compute a watermark definition in response to the received signal (column 3 lines 45-47, column 5 lines 42-67, column 6 lines 1-38). Linnartz does not explicitly describe a second watermark definition. But following the logic used in rejecting claim 1 and claim 13, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill that the method for computing a watermark definition in response to a signal delineated by Linnartz, can be used to compute the definition for a second watermark definition described by Bloom.

Claim 16 is rejected as applied above in rejected claim 10. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark examiner according to claim 10 and wherein the signal comprises authentication information from establishing that the signal originates from an authentic source (column 2 lines 33-41, column 8 lines 57-62), and

the watermark signal receiver also includes:

signal verification apparatus operative to verify the authentication information to determine whether the authentication information is correct and to reject the received signal if the authentication information is determine to be incorrect, thereby causing the first watermark definition to be used for examining if the authentication information is incorrect (column 2 lines 33-41, column 8 lines 57-62).

Claim 18 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 17. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A method according to claim 17 and wherein said altering step comprises:
altering the first electronic representation to no longer comprise the first watermark (column 1 lines 5-15, column 2 lines 1-31).

Claim 19 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 17. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A method according to claim 17 and also comprising:
examining at least a second electronic representation for the second watermark (Fig. 5, column 2 lines 1-31, column 4 lines 60-67, column 6 lines 39-43, column 7 lines 21-43, column 8 lines 43-49, column 9 18-22).

Claim 23 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 22. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A system according to claim 22 and wherein said altering comprises:

altering the first electronic representation to no longer comprise the first watermark (column 1 lines 5-15, column 2 lines 1-31).

Claim 24 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 22. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A system according to claim 22 and also comprising:

watermark examining apparatus for examining at least a second electronic representation for the second watermark (Fig. 5, column 2 lines 1-31, column 4 lines 60-67, column 6 lines 39-43, column 7 lines 21-43, column 8 lines 43-49, column 9 18-22).

Claim 28 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 27. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A signal according to claim 27 and also comprising:

authentication information for establishing that the signal originates from an authentic source (column 2 lines 33-41, column 8 lines 57-62).

Claim 20 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 19. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses a method of examining an electronic representation of an item of a watermark. Linnartz describes one electronic representation, but does not explicitly describe a second electronic representation. Bloom describes a scenario where the first and second electronic representations are identical (column 7 lines 1-8). The addition of the second electronic representation adds another layer of security to the invention of

Linnartz in that it now provides redundant watermarks, in case the first watermark is tampered with or altered. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine the system taught by Linnartz with the two identical electronic representations delineated by Bloom to create a more secure and redundant watermark system that is more resistant to tampering and alteration.

Claim 21 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 20. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A method according to claim 19 and also comprising:
controlling access to an electronic representation.

Linnartz discloses a method of examining an electronic representation of an item for a watermark, comprising controlling access to an electronic representation. Linnartz does not explicitly describe controlling access to the second electronic representation based on a result of examining at least a second electronic representation step. Bloom delineates a second electronic representation that is used to create a second watermark that is inserted into the data representation. Linnartz teaches an embodiment of the receiver device that secures the communications against tampering (column 2 lines 32-41). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the access control system delineated by Linnartz on the to control access to the second electronic representation described by Bloom to achieve a more secure and robust communication between sender and receiver.

Claim 25 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 24. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses a method of examining an electronic representation of an item of a watermark. Linnartz describes one electronic representation, but does not explicitly describe a second electronic representation. Bloom describes a scenario where the first and second electronic representations are identical (column 7 lines 1-8). The addition of the second electronic representation adds another layer of security to the invention of Linnartz in that it now provides redundant watermarks, in case the first watermark is tampered with or altered. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine the system taught by Linnartz with the two identical electronic representations delineated by Bloom to create a more secure and redundant watermark system that is more resistant to tampering and alteration.

Claim 26 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 24. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses a method of examining an electronic representation of an item for a watermark, comprising controlling access to an electronic representation. Linnartz does not explicitly describe controlling access to the second electronic representation based on a result of examining at least a second electronic representation step. Bloom delineates a second electronic representation that is used to create a second watermark that is inserted into the data representation. Linnartz teaches an embodiment of the receiver device that secures the communications against tampering (column 2 lines 32-

41). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the access control system delineated by Linnartz on the to control access to the second electronic representation described by Bloom to achieve a more secure and robust communication between sender and receiver.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaveh Abrishamkar whose telephone number is 703-305-8892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-8892.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

KA
11/26/03


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100